

REMARKS

The foregoing amendments and these remarks are in response to the Final Office Action dated April 4, 2006. This amendment is timely filed.

At the time of the Office Action, claims 1-4 were pending. In the Final Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claim 4 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The rejections are discussed in more detail below.

I. Rejections on Art

Claims 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,682,045 to Hashimoto ("Hashimoto"). Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,698,919 to Obara ("Obara") in view of Sanyko. Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Obara in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,218,760 to Sakuragi ("Sakuragi"), and U.S. Patent No. RE38,673 to Elsässer et al. ("Elsässer"). Claim 4 was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

In response to the Office Action, applicant hereby amends claim 1 to incorporate the subject matter of claim 2 and allowable claim 4 therein.

Hashimoto discloses that a rotor 72 comprises a supporting member 72c serving to hold a ring-shaped magnet 72b, and that the supporting member 72c is comprised of a synthetic resin wherein the magnet is insert molded into the supporting member 72c. However, Hashimoto neither teaches nor suggests in what direction the magnet 72b (corresponding to the ring-shaped permanent magnet of the invention) should have a thermal expansion coefficient.

Obara discloses that the hub 9 with the magnet 15 provided in the inner periphery thereof is, together with the sleeve 10, formed as a one-piece structure. Obara, however, is also silent as to in what direction the magnet 15 (corresponding to the ring-shaped permanent magnet of the invention) should have a thermal expansion coefficient.

The same can be said for the other cited references, Sakuragi and Elsässer, as they include no teachings or suggestion on the relationship between the ring-shaped permanent magnet and the thermal expansion coefficient.

Thus, it is strongly believed that such unique concept of the present invention would not have been thought of by any person of ordinary skill in the art in view of any combination of the cited prior art. It is strongly believed that any combination of the cited prior art would not make it possible to achieve the action and effect of the invention, being capable of rigidly fixing a permanent magnet to a supporting member without any clearance between the contact surfaces thereof.

As discussed above, the present invention as set forth in the amended claims should not be rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) or 103. Reconsideration by the Examiner is respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

Applicants have made every effort to present claims which distinguish over the prior art, and it is thus believed that all claims are in condition for allowance. Nevertheless, Applicants invite the Examiner to call the undersigned if it is believed that a telephonic interview would expedite the prosecution of the application to an allowance. In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims.

Date: 7/3/06

Respectfully submitted,



J. Rodman Steele, Jr.
Registration No. 25,931
Sarah E. Smith
Registration No. 50,488
AKERMAN SENTERFITT
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Telephone: (561) 653-5000

Docket No. 1625-172